

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 20-22 remain rejected on the prior art grounds of record. Claims 4-19 and 23-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by European Patent Publication EP 49521 A2 to Nakanishi et al. (hereinafter “Nakanishi”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

an inter-process communication unit which controls inter-process communication between processes executed on the plurality of processors, which inter-process communication unit is functionally provided independently of said OS,

wherein said inter-process communication unit receives a system call request related to said inter-process communication issued from processes of said one processor or said another processor to said OS for single processors and issues a request for process control to said OS for single processors of said one processor or said another processor by using a system call.

The Examiner maintains that the interprocessor communication control sections 303 of Nakanishi correspond to the claimed inter-process communication unit. *See* Nakanishi at Figures 1 and 2. However, both the operating system processor 3001 and the job processors 302 to 300n contain interprocessor communication control sections 303. *See* Nakanishi at Figure 1; page 3, line 13 to page 4, line 24. The reference teaches that either control section 303 of

operating system processor 3001 or control section 303 of job processor 300k can transmit or receive an interruption input, which the Examiner analogizes to the claimed system call request. *See* Nakanishi at page 5, lines 1922; page 6, line 28 to page 7, line 7. However, claim 1 recites that the system call request is “issued from processes of said one processor or said another processor to said OS for single processors.” That is, for one of the control sections 303 of Nakanishi to receive a system call request issued from a process to the OS, as described in claim 1, the only control system that even arguably meets the claim limitation is control section 303 of the operating system processor 3001.

However, in asserting that Nakanishi teaches an inter-process communication unit that “issues a request for process control to said OS for single processors,” the Examiner refers to the control section 303 of the job processor 300k. *See* Office Action at page 3 (citing Nakanishi at page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 14). In other words, the Examiner inconsistently refers to different elements of the reference (*e.g.*, control sections 303 of operating system processor 3001 and job processor 300k) as allegedly corresponding to claimed inter-process communication unit.

Assuming *arguendo* that the control section 303 of operating system processor 3001 corresponds to the claimed inter-process communication unit, such control section 303 of Nakanishi is not “functionally provided independently of said OS,” as claimed in claim 1. In fact, as shown in Figures 1 and 2 of Nakanishi, control section 303 of operating system processor 3001 is physically and functionally intrinsic to the operating system processor 3001. Therefore, the control section 303 of operating system processor 3001 cannot correspond to the claimed inter-process communication unit, because it is not functionally provided independently of the OS.

In support of the Examiner's position that Nakanishi teaches the claimed inter-process communication unit is functionally provided independently of said OS, the Examiner refers to page 12, line 27 to page 13, line 5. However, this portion of the reference refers to the control section 303 of input/output processor 300n (*i.e.*, another job processor similar to processor 300k) transmitting interruption input to control section 303 of operating system processor 3001. Even assuming *arguendo* that the control section 303 of input/output processor 300n is functionally provided independently of the OS, this control section 303 does not "receive a system call request...issued from processes...to said OS for single processors." Rather, the control section 303 of input/output processor 300n relied upon by the Examiner transmits the interruption input to the operating system processor 3001.

Furthermore, the Examiner cites page 4, lines 24-28 of Nakanishi in support of his position that the reference teaches an inter-process communication unit that is functionally provided independently of the OS. However, this portion of the reference also refers to the control section 303 of input/output processor 300n, which as discussed above, cannot correspond to the claimed inter-process communication unit because this control section 303 does not "receive a system call request...issued from processes...to said OS for single processors."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's inconsistent application of Nakanishi to the claimed features is not supportable. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Nakanishi for at least the foregoing reasons.

B. Claims 2, 3 and 20-22

Since claim 20 recites features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 20 is patentable over Nakanishi for at least reasons similar to

those set forth for claim 1. Since claims 2-3 and 21-22 are dependent upon claims 1 and 20, respectively, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable over Nakanishi at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl J. Pellegrin
Registration No. 40,766

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 6, 2008